



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

dn

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,644	10/31/2003	Frederico Garza	1693.1015	8471
21171	7590	04/05/2005		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				EXAMINER VANORE, DAVID A
				ART UNIT 2881
				PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,644	GARZA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David A. Vanore	2881	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10-12 and 14 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 7 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 7,9,13 and 15 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.  
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.  	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.  

***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The reference in Claim 7 to an Axcelis GSD platform implanter is not present in the specification.

***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the ion gauges and Axcelis GSD platform implanter must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 7 recites the device of Claim 1 where the device is an Axcelis GSD platform implanter. No description relating to the features of this element are present in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 contains the trademark/trade name Axcelis GSD. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a particular ion implantation device and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 7 redefines the meaning of the term "device" in claim 1 to be "an Axcelis GSD platform implanter." The claim does not recite additional elements to limit the parent claim.

Claims 9, 13, and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 9, 13, and 15 recite "a faraday". A faraday is a unit of measurement, not an art related term describing a detection means. The term "faraday" modifies a noun, such

as disk, cup, or cage to indicate a recognized detection function. Appropriate correction is required.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, and 14 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

After extensive search of the Axcelis website, US Patent Documentation via the EAST search system on ion implantation relevant to the claimed invention and specification, and the Internet using the Google and Yahoo search engines on the terms "Axcelis", "Axcelis GSD", and "Axcelis GSD Implant," no technical information has been uncovered teaching the constituents of the Axcelis GSD implant platform. Therefore, the evaluation of the patent claims has been made on all other available information. The technical information held by Axcelis is not publicly available at the time of the Office action. Similarly, the examiner has investigated the technical papers offered by Varian, Applied Materials, and Sumitomo Eaton Nova Corporation on their websites. No applicable teachings were uncovered.

Regarding the claims in relation to the prior art, claims 1 and 15 are the pending independent claims in the instant application. After thorough review of the prior art, it is the opinion of the examiner that the prior art does not teach or suggest an ion implantation device having first and second ion gauges where the ion gauges are selectively connected with a switching means.

The most relevant prior art to the instant invention is USPN 6,657,209 B2 to Halling. Note Fig. 1B in particular. The teaching of Halling characterizes developing

pressure compensation using a single ion gauge present inside the ion implantation chamber. No suggestion or teaching towards a second ion gauge is present. The examiner considered making an rejection of at least claims 1 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) utilizing the Halling reference and one or both of USPN 6,054,862 A to Zhou and USPN 5,306,408 A to Treglio. Both teach an ion gauge outside of the working chamber. However, neither teach an additional ion gauge or associated switching means. While an argument on the grounds of duplication of parts could be made for an additional ion gauge, the examiner does not consider the provision of a switching means coupling the two ion gauges to be an obvious modification of the prior art. For example, USPN 3,278,837 to Vanderschmidt teaches an ion gauge switching circuit. However, this circuit couples an ion gauge and an ion current detector, not a second ion gauge. The arrangement claimed would sample ion pressure at two different locations in the implantation device and this function is simply not taught or suggested in the prior art.

Therefore, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the device recited in claim 1. Claim 7 being the only claim rejected in the application, claims 2-6 and 8, 10-12, and 14 are therefore allowable by virtue of their dependency.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The examiner has provided on the attached form PTO-892 a list of the most relevant patent documents and references considered during formulation of the instant Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A. Vanore whose telephone number is (571) 272-2483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dav



David A. Vanore  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800